



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

earth. I knew it, it was the odour that always precedes a thunderstorm, and a nameless fear clutched at my heart"⁷¹.

In general, however, one is disposed to agree with Cornwall's couplet: "Those that are weather-wise are seldom otherwise".

It is impossible to separate the weather lore of the Greeks and the Romans. The Latin poets seem to be following blindly a Greek literary tradition⁷². They are obviously more indebted to their reading than to their own observation or to familiarity with weather lore of their own countrymen. If, however, all instances of prognostics which are the same in both Greek and Latin were to be ascribed to Greek sources, there would be but a small Roman residuum. The notion that the crow, for instance, is a weather prophet is almost as cosmopolitan as the bird, and it would be rash to say that the Roman peasant had no crow lore of his own. Still, even a casual reading of this article must leave one with the impression that the Greeks were more versatile, if not more accurate, prognosticators.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY, EUGENE S. MCCARTNEY.
Evanston, Ill.

REVIEWS

Die Griechische Tragödie. By Johannes Geffcken.
Leipzig: B. G. Teubner (1918). Pp. 116.

Die Griechische Komödie. By Alfred Körte. Leipzig:
B. G. Teubner (1914). Pp. 104.

These two books, belonging to the series entitled *Aus Natur und Geisteswelt*, are written for the average reader, by experts who have the will and the ability to interpret a subject in its larger relations. Körte's book is based upon a course of lectures delivered to a popular audience in Frankfurt. Both books are well done. While they are not addressed to scholars, a scholar may read them with profit, for though brief in compass they are new-minted coin.

Geffcken's *Tragedy* begins with a discussion of origins, and of the theater, then considers the early drama down through the Promethean trilogy, the Orestean trilogy, the earlier plays of Sophocles, *Antigone* and *Ajax*, and then the *Trachiniae*. This last piece, Geffcken holds, may be placed, on stylistic grounds, as first in time of a group which includes also *Oedipus Tyrannus* and *Electra*. In the *Trachiniae*, Euripidean influence begins to appear, for example in the character of *Deianira*, 'sketched with a pencil that is almost Euripidean'. This play serves as an introduction to Euripides, whose *Alcestis*, *Medea*, and *Hippolytus* are then passed in review. A reference to the character of *Phaedra* as a kind of challenge which Sophocles accepted in his lost tragedy, *Phaedra*, leads us back to Sophocles. The *Oedipus Tyrannus* is then quite fully discussed, with frequent indications that the author of

the discussion has been stimulated by Robert's *Oedipus*. Geffcken is a sympathetic critic, but he does not fail to touch upon the foibles of Sophocles, such as the excessive occurrence of the suicide motive, and the inevitable oracle. From this point on Geffcken passes back and forth, showing the play of action and reaction between the two contemporary poets. He deals with the *Electras*, with the extant *Philoctetes* of Sophocles as compared with the recoverable plots of the like-named tragedies of Aeschylus and Euripides, and with the *Phoenissae* of Euripides, considered as a treatment of the Theban story, over against the *Oedipus at Colonus*. The last play considered is the *Iphigenia at Aulis*, in which Geffcken finds Euripides truly himself in his portraiture of despicable old men, nobly impulsive young men, and generous womanhood. The book closes with a brief chapter on the effect of Greek tragedy.

While the whole book is suggestive, especial mention may be made of the warmth and the lightness of touch with which Euripides and the Sophists are treated. There is much of value in the chapter on Aeschylus, particularly in the way of observations upon his instinctive dramatic sense and the growth of his dramatic skill. Both the Suppliants and the Prometheus are treated not as isolated pieces but as members of a trilogy. This means something for the Prometheus, which has suffered much at the hands of the philosophical school. The true approach is, as Geffcken says, not philosophical but historical. Aeschylus is first a playwright, with a master's feeling for a great situation. Such a situation he found in the Prometheus story, as it came to him from the past. He shaped and combined his material with the instinct of a dramatist. The philosophical interpretation represents, then, not the mind of Aeschylus, but the reaction of his work upon later minds. The reciprocal influence of the young Sophocles and the older Aeschylus finds illustration in the character of the Prometheus as a transition play, connecting the earlier manner with the mature art of the Orestea, while the Triptolemus of Sophocles is found to have been influenced by the Prometheus. In the *Antigone*, the much discussed verses, 904-920, are held to be genuine. Not that Geffcken admires this purple patch, for he does not. He holds with Masqueray that modern and ancient taste differ, and that this passage is a criterion of difference. Just as Sophocles gradually became Euripidean, so, Geffcken holds, Euripides was at first Sophoclean, for instance in making his *Alcestis* as unwavering as *Ajax* or *Antigone*. Geffcken has a keen eye for dramatic types. It is quite in accordance with the current view of the intimate relation of Euripides and later comedy that Aegeus in the *Medea* should be called the forerunner of the good uncle of comedy' and *Phaedra's* nurse 'a new Euripidean type, the procuress'.

Körte's *Comedy* follows a plan quite like that of Geffcken's *Tragedy*. In point of style the work is hardly so well phrased. After the opening chapter

⁷¹Helen Keller, *The Story of my Life*, 26.

⁷²Vergil is clearly under obligation to Aratus, and Aratus versifies the *De Signis* of Theophrastus, who in turn is indebted to Aristotle. Pliny, too, copied Greek sources.

on the origin of comedy, which includes a fresh and suggestive treatment of Epicharmus, Old Comedy is considered in detail, so far as the year 405 B. C. With the Frogs of Aristophanes, which came out in this year, we have the end of an era, and of a chapter. In Chapter III the Ecclesiazusae and the Plutus of Aristophanes keep company with Middle Comedy. Chapter IV is given to Menander. The heart of the book is of course Chapter II. Although Aristophanes dominates, his great contemporaries, Cratinus and Eupolis, are not forgotten. So, too, Teleclides and Pherecrates are mentioned to illustrate the fact that Old Comedy before Aristophanes was not exclusively devoted to personal and political attack, but used folk-lore motives and even real life. Körte points out that travesty of mythological subjects and portrayal of real life are a stream that can be traced as far back as Epicharmus, a stream that Aristophanes makes us forget, but one that flowed on until it emerged in the comedy of the fourth century.

Körte's judgment of Aristophanes is summed up in the words, 'the great political comedy of Athens is one of the wonders of the Greek world, in its way as distinguished and as inimitable as the Parthenon or the Hermes of Praxiteles'. Along with analysis of the extant comedies and comment upon the action and quality of the several pieces, Körte gives, each time in its chronological place, a detailed account of two works which within recent years have been in part recovered, the Dionysalexandros of Cratinus and the Demoi of Eupolis. He points out, in the case of the former, Cratinus, that two old elements of comedy, travesty and political abuse, are present, although in an imperfect blend. The Demoi of Eupolis, which received high praise in antiquity, is summarized by Körte, who traces clearly the outlines of a real comedy of political satire. Among the plays of Aristophanes the Birds is singled out for special treatment as being the most brilliant, while at the same time the author finds in it two signs that Old Comedy has reached its zenith: one, the fact that the *agon* is no longer a real contest, and the other, the fact that the poet here seeks to bring the parabasis into organic relation with the rest of the piece, with the result that the local root is severed. The parabasis in all its lusty vigor, surcharged with fighting spirit, is found in the Knights; in the Birds the fighting spirit is gone. In the Thesmophoriazusae are noted gradual changes, suggestive of Middle Comedy; the beginnings of characterization, and the exposition made without dropping the comic mask.

The Ecclesiazusae and the Plutus are put in the category of Middle Comedy. In this chapter Körte deals to very good purpose with the influence exerted by later Euripidean tragedy, in that by an assimilation of form Greek comedy became like tragedy in structure and incident, and particularly in the use of the motive of love, which was introduced by Euripides, was presumably used by Middle Comedy, and demonstrably by New Comedy.

The chapter on New Comedy is wholly devoted to Menander, whom Körte praises, but with discrimination. Menander's great strength he finds in characterization, not in incident, for names and incidents are repeated in plays which are essentially different. 'Paradoxical as it may sound, the action and its pre-suppositions are for the poet a matter of indifference'. Considerable extracts from the New Menander are given to illustrate the poet's skill and ethical purpose; for example, Körte finds in the slave Daos (Davus) not a mere jolly, impudent fellow, like Sandy (Xanthos) in Aristophanes, but an individual character, morally superior to his betters.

The opening chapters in both books on origins invite comment, but I have space for only brief reference. Körte regards comedy as a blend of at least two elements, the Athenian *comus* and a particular type of Peloponnesian clown, who was *μεγαλογαστρωρ και μεγαλόπυγος και φαλλικός*. This clown was originally not a man but an attendant of Dionysus, distinct from both the equine and the caprine sort. His existence is inferred from two facts, the known costume of the comic actor in Athens, and the known costume of the Italian *phlyaces*. This clown, upon festive occasions, relieved the *comus* when its members were out of breath; these two elements, clown and *comus*, originally mere associates, later became one group, and so comedy arose. The process of blending can no longer be followed in its details, 'but the whole history of Attic comedy consists in the ever renewed effort to weld into an artistic whole these two heterogeneous parts'. The relation of Dionysus to comedy, then, was through the actor as well as through the chorus; and this may even have been the closer relation. As for the origin of tragedy, Geffcken holds fast to the doctrine that the dithyramb out of which tragedy came had originally something of levity in it, and that the satyr play is this levity in segregated form. This is distinct from the newer view represented by Professor Flickinger, that the satyr play is throughout an independent development. These are but two points in the discussion of origins, a subject of endless interest.

HAMILTON COLLEGE.

EDWARD FITCH.

'ΟΙ πολέμοι 1912-1913, 'The War 1912-1913'. By Gregorios Xenopoulos. Athens: Joannes D. Kollaros (1920). 7 Drachmas.

'The War', by Gregorios Xenopoulos, a leading novelist and playwright of contemporary Greece, is a story of Athenian life during the momentous events of 1912 and 1913 which mark the end of a period of national humiliation and the beginning of a new era for Greece. The plot is woven around the two chief characters, Helle and Paul. Helle is the daughter of an Athenian aristocrat, who felt the new impulse long before the outbreak of the Balkan Wars. She has faith in the world about her, and her ideals are untarnished by the luxurious surroundings among which she